



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/704,281	11/01/2000	Craig Rubendall	343355600023	2712

7590 02/23/2004
John V Biernacki
Jones Day Reavis & Pogue
North Point
901 Lakeide Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CINDY

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2171

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2004

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

dm

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/704,281

Applicant(s)

RUBENDALL, CRAIG

Examiner

Cindy Nguyen

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 November 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 14-32 and 39-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 6-13 and 33-38 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 November 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to application filed on 11/01/2000 in which claims 1-46 are presented for examination.

1. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 5, 15-17, 20-29, 40-42, 45 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ranger (U.S 5999940) in view of Motoyama et al. (U.S 6085196) (Motoyama and further in view of Ainsbury et al. (U.S 6078924) (Ainsbury).

Regarding claims 1 and 28, Ranger discloses: A computer-implemented method and apparatus for retrieving a subset of object data from a persistence layer over a network, wherein the persistence layer (310, fig. 3, Ranger) is structured at least partially upon an object model definition (col. 8, lines 18-48, Ranger) , comprising the steps of:

(a) receiving over the network (200, fig. 2, Ranger) a request from a client computer (210, fig. 2, Ranger) for object persisted data stored in the persistence layer (310, fig. 3, Ranger);

(b) parsing the request to obtain search criteria and object association data, wherein the object association data identifies at least one association between a pair of objects (col. 11, lines 51 to col. 12, lines 9, Motoyama);

Art Unit: 2171

(c) creating filtering criteria based upon the parsed search criteria and parsed object association data, wherein the object model definition determines how the search criteria and the object association data form the filtering criteria (col. 12, lines 30-49, Ranger);

(e) transmitting the object data subset to the client computer over the network (col. 14, lines 3-19, Ranger).

However, Ranger didn't disclose: (b) parsing the request to obtain search criteria and object association data, wherein the object association data identifies at least one association between a pair of objects. On the other hand, Motoyama discloses: (b) parsing the request to obtain search criteria and object association data, wherein the object association data identifies at least one association between a pair of objects (col. 11, lines 51 to col. 12, lines 9, Motoyama). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the step parsing the request to obtain search criteria and object association data, wherein the object association data identifies at least one association between a pair of objects in the system of Ranger as taught by Motoyama. The motivation being to enable the system analyzes and breaks down input documents into recognizable components parts to be passed to other modules of the system (col. 11, lines 51-67, Motoyama).

However, Ranger/Motoyama didn't disclose: (d) filtering object data from the persistence layer by the filtering criteria in order to generate the object data subset. On the other hand, Ainsbury discloses: filtering object data from the persistence layer by the filtering criteria in 15 order to generate the object data subset (col. 31, lines 48 to col. 32, lines 20, Ainsbury). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the step filtering object data from the persistence layer by the filtering criteria

Art Unit: 2171

in order to generate the object data subset in the combination system of Ranger/Motoyama as taught by Ainsbury. The motivation being to enable the user view a list of items and their associated properties in ascending or descending order based on a selected property (col. 31, lines 48-52, Aimsbury).

In addition, Ranger/Motoyama/Ainsbury discloses: a server computer connected to the network (200, 210, 220, fig. 2, Ranger);

A mapping module (331, fig. 3, Ranger) connected to the object model definition (321, fig. 3, Ranger) and to the persistence layer (310, fig. 3, Ranger);

An object model definition that contains object class metadata (col. 6, lines 4-23, Ranger).

Regarding claims 2 and 29, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1 and 28 above, respectively. In addition, Ranger/Motoyama/Aimsbury discloses: wherein the request includes object criteria nodes and object association role nodes (col. 11, lines 37-49, Aimsbury), said method further comprising the steps of:

parsing the request into object criteria nodes and object association role nodes (col. 13, lines 12-28, Motoyama);

creating the filtering criteria based upon the parsed object criteria nodes and the parsed object association role nodes (col. 14, lines 31-58, Motoyama).

Regarding claim 5, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 2 above. In addition, Ranger/Motoyama/Aimsbury discloses: wherein parsed nodes include the parsed object criteria nodes and the parsed association role nodes (col. 11, lines 51 to col. 12, lines 10, Motoyama).

Art Unit: 2171

Regarding claims 15 and 40, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1 and 28 above, respectively. In addition, Ranger/Motoyama/Aimsbury discloses: wherein the persistence layer is an object-oriented database management system (col. 6, lines 10-23, Ranger).

Regarding claims 16 and 41, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1 and 28 above, respectively. In addition, Ranger/Motoyama/Aimsbury discloses: wherein the persistence layer is an XML formatted file (col. 10, lines 18-22, Ranger).

Regarding claims 17 and 42, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1 and 28 above, respectively. In addition, Ranger/Motoyama/Aimsbury discloses: wherein the network is a network selected from the group consisting of local area networks, intranets, wide area networks, global networks, Internet, and combinations thereof (122, 128, 120, 102, fig. 1, 200, fig. 2, Range).

Regarding claims 20 and 45, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1 and 28 above, respectively. In addition, Ranger/Motoyama/Aimsbury discloses: wherein the object model definition includes object class data, object attribute data, and object association data (313, fig. 3 and corresponding text, Ranger).

Regarding claims 21 and 46, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1 and 28 above, respectively. In addition, Ranger/Motoyama/Aimsbury discloses: wherein the object model definition is based upon an entity relationship diagram definition (col. 7, lines 47-61, Ranger).

Regarding claim 22, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 21 above. In addition, Ranger/Motoyama/Aimsbury discloses: wherein the persistence

Art Unit: 2171

layer is a relational database management system (col. 6, lines 10-23, Ranger), said method further comprising the steps of: creating a structured query language statement to be used as the filtering criteria (col. 8, lines 30-40, Ranger), wherein the parsed search criteria and the parsed object association data are formatted in accordance with metadata from the entity relationship diagram definition in order to create the structure query language statement; and using the created structured query language statement to retrieve query results from the relational database management system (col. 8, lines 52 to col. 9, lines 39, Ranger).

Regarding claim 23, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 22 above. In addition, Ranger/Motoyama/Aimsbury discloses: further comprising the steps of: generating the object data subset by encoding the query results with tags to indicate object associations, object attributes and object classes (col. 50, lines 57 to col. 52, lines 30, Aimsbury), wherein the encoding with tags is performed based upon encoding rules means and upon metadata from the entity relationship diagram definition (col. 50, lines 57 to col. 52, lines 30, Aimsbury); and transmitting the encoded object data subset to the client computer over the network (col. 14, lines 3-19, Ranger).

Regarding claim 24, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 21 above. In addition, Ranger/Motoyama/Aimsbury discloses: wherein the encoding is performed using Extensible Markup Language (XML) tags (col. 50, lines 57 to col. 52, lines 30, Aimsbury), said method further comprising the step of: transmitting the encoded object data subset to the client computer in order for the client computer to parse the encoded object data subset by an XML searching mechanism (col. 50, lines 57 to col. 52, lines 30, Aimsbury).

Regarding claim 25, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Ranger/Motoyama/Aimsbury discloses: wherein in step (d) the filtering of the object data is performed when the object data is retrieved from the persistence layer (col. 14, lines 52 to col. 15, lines 21, Ranger).

Regarding claim 26, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Ranger/Motoyama/Aimsbury discloses: wherein in step (d) the filtering of the object data is performed when the object data is retrieved from the persistence layer using a portion of the parsed search criteria, and after the object data is retrieved from the persistence layer the object data is further filtered by criteria contained in the; other portions of the parsed search criteria (col. 14, lines 52 to col. 15, lines 21, Ranger).

Regarding claim 27, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Ranger/Motoyama/Aimsbury discloses: wherein in step (d) the filtering of the object data is performed after the object data is retrieved from the persistence layer (col. 14, lines 52 to col. 15, lines 21, Ranger).

3. Claims 3, 4, 14, 30 –32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ranger (U.S 5999940) in view of Motoyama et al. (U.S 6085196) (Motoyama and further in view of Ainsbury et al. (U.S 6078924) (Ainsbury) and further in view of Bulletin of Technical Committee on Data Engineering, 09, 1999, vol. 22, No. 3 (Committee).

Regarding claims 3 and 30, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 2 and 29 above. However, Ranger/Motoyama/Aimsbury didn't disclose: wherein the request alternates between an object criteria node and an object association role node. On the other hand, Committee discloses: wherein the request alternates between an object

Art Unit: 2171

criteria node and an object association role node (page 15). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the step the request alternates between an object criteria node and an object association role node. in the combination system of Ranger/Motoyama/ Ainsbury as taught by Committee. The motivation being to enable the user using SQL to query such a structure requires traversing arbitrary paths through XML elements (page 15).

Regarding claim 32, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 29 above. In addition, Ranger/Motoyama/Ainsbury/Committee discloses: wherein nodes include the object criteria nodes and the association rule notes (page 15, Committee).

Regarding claims 4 and 31, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 2 and 29 above. In addition, Ranger/Motoyama/Ainsbury/Committee discloses: reviewing over the network from the client computer the request formatted in an XPATH specification format (page 7-8, section 2.2).

Regarding claim 14, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Ranger/Motoyama/Ainsbury discloses: further comprising the step of: encoding the object data subset with tags to indicate associations, attributes and classes of objects that are in the object data subset (page 13-17, Bulletin of the Technical committee),

wherein the encoding with tags is performed based upon encoding rules means and upon metadata from the object model definition (page 13-17, Bulletin of the Technical committee).

Art Unit: 2171

4. Claims 18, 19, 39, 43 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ranger (U.S 5999940) in view of Motoyama et al. (U.S 6085196) (Motoyama and further in view of Ainsbury et al. (U.S 6078924) (Ainsbury) and further in view of Arief et al. "A UML tool for an automatic generation of simulation programs", ACM 09, 2000.

Regarding claims 18 and 43, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1 and 28 above. However, Ranger/Motoyama/Ainsbury didn't disclose: wherein the object model definition is based upon a Unified Modeling Language (UML) format. On the other hand, Arief discloses: wherein the object model definition is based upon a Unified Modeling Language (UML) format (section 2. Using UML, page 72, Arief). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the object model definition is based upon a Unified Modeling Language (UML) format in the combination system of Ranger/Motoyama/ Ainsbury as taught by Arief. The motivation being enable the system represents as an interaction diagram, which consists of objects and their relationships, including the messages that might be sent from one object to another (section 2. Using UML, page 72, Arief)

Regarding claim 19, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 18 above. In addition, Ranger/Motoyama/Ainsbury/Arief discloses: further comprising the steps of: encoding the object data subset with tags to indicate object associations, object attributes and object classes, wherein the encoding with tags is performed based upon encoding rules means and upon metadata from the UML object model definition (section 5.3, page 75, Arief).

Art Unit: 2171

As per claims 39 and 44, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claims 43 and 19 and 28 above. In addition, Ranger/Motoyama/Aimsbury/Arief discloses: wherein the server computer transmits the encoded the object data subset to the client computer over the network (col. 14, lines 3-19, Ranger).

5. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6-13, 33-38 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of record and that encountered while searching for the claimed invention fails to anticipate and/or suggest: A computer-implemented method and apparatus for retrieving a subset of object data from a persistence layer over a network, wherein the persistence layer is structured at least partially upon an object model definition, comprising the steps of: selecting, obtaining and placing as recited in claims 6 and 33.

Regarding claims 7-13 and 34-38, these claims depend from claims 6 and 33 above respectively and are therefore allowable.

6. Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cindy Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-4698. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this

Art Unit: 2171

application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

CN
Cindy Nguyen
February 13, 2004

Wayne
WAYNE AMSBURY
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER